KEY ITEMS.

1. Academic Misconduct – Post-Enrollment. The NCAA Division I Committee on Academics continued its discussion of post-enrollment academic misconduct and the appropriate role of the NCAA. The committee clarified that member institutions have a responsibility to determine post-enrollment academic misconduct while also determining whether NCAA bylaws have been violated. The committee will continue to seek membership feedback as it refines legislative concepts and language. The committee anticipates that the current concepts will be in final legislative format by June and will be sponsored for the 2015-16 legislative cycle. [Informational Item No. 1]

2. Committee on Academics Liaisons – Division I Governance Structure. [Informational Item No. 2]
   a. NCAA Division I Legislative Committee. To help ensure that clear, efficient and effective perspectives on academic matters are reflected within future legislative recommendations, two Committee on Academics members were appointed to serve on the new Legislative Committee, which reports to the NCAA Division I Council.
   b. Council. In addition to having committee members serve on the Legislative Committee, the committee continued to support its January recommendation that a Committee on Academics liaison be appointed to the full Council. The committee recognized that the Council may consider alternative approaches, but during its deliberations the Council should consider how best to include a Committee on Academics perspective on matters, both legislative and nonlegislative, that may have an academic nexus and go to the full Council.

ACTION ITEMS.

1. Legislative Items.
   • None.

2. Nonlegislative Items.
   • None.
INFORMATIONAL ITEMS.

1. **Academic Misconduct – Post-Enrollment.** The committee continued its review of post-enrollment academic misconduct. The committee reviewed membership feedback received since the committee's most recent meeting in January. The committee recognized that nearly 20 meetings with a wide range of membership entities have occurred since summer 2014, and it is anticipated that upward of 20 additional meetings will occur prior to the committee sponsoring a final legislative proposal. In its review, the committee noted the importance of membership feedback and guidance and reaffirmed that academic misconduct legislation is warranted for a variety of reasons, including maintaining public trust in the NCAA as an entity of higher education.

In order to address differing philosophical viewpoints and to enhance current draft language, the committee scrutinized the draft future academic misconduct legislation. An element of committee discussion included consideration of numerous academic misconduct scenarios and resulted in robust committee dialogue about the role of the NCAA and member institutions in determining and reporting institutional academic misconduct to the NCAA.

The committee refined, and in some instances supplemented, the legislative concepts it endorsed in January regarding post-enrollment academic misconduct. Based on membership feedback and committee discussion, legislative concepts that were refined are as follows:

a. Academic misconduct legislation should articulate institutional obligation and responsibility for determining when academic misconduct has occurred on its campus. The committee noted that the notion of autonomy should be modified as a core principle to reflect that institutional academic misconduct issues are handled by the institution, and the institution also has the supplemental responsibility to determine whether NCAA bylaws have been violated notwithstanding the institution's campus determination of academic misconduct. Academic misconduct is a shared, blended responsibility of institutions and the NCAA as a governing body, with the institution responsible for both its institutional process and adherence to NCAA minimum academic misconduct standards. The division should give deference and account for institutional variabilities while also refining minimum expectations that help promote consistent division-wide academic misconduct application and reinforce the NCAA's commitment to sound academic principles.

b. As a minimum standard, legislation should note that involvement of institutional personnel, representatives of athletics interests, or other third parties may result in an NCAA violation notwithstanding an institution's campus determination of
academic misconduct. The committee noted that legislation should require institutions to have sufficient institutional policies and procedures in place in order to provide for consistent institutional determinations regarding academic misconduct for student-athletes when compared to decisions rendered for the general student-body.

c. Academic misconduct occurring solely between a student-athlete and another student should be handled by the institution in accordance with its written institutional policies and procedures on academic misconduct. Violations should be reported when the misconduct resulted in the student-athlete being inaccurately certified eligible. Current application requires an erroneous certification and student-athlete competition.

The committee also discussed whether student-athletes were being sufficiently educated on institution-specific academic misconduct policies and procedures, and the committee considered exploring the potential of including student-athlete education as a legislated requirement. The committee noted that member institutions should review, or establish, student-athlete focused education regardless of whether an academic misconduct education component is legislated.

Committee and membership feedback will be combined to produce an enhanced legislative draft that the committee will review at its April meeting. The committee will also seek input from the NCAA Division I Board of Directors during the Board's April meeting. The committee will continue its review in an effort to finalize legislation by June 2015 and sponsor a proposal for the 2015-16 legislative cycle. The membership would then have an opportunity to formally review before the Council vote in April 2016.

2. **Reports of the Council.** The committee reviewed the reports of the January 17 and February 3-4, 2015, meetings. The February report reflected a need to appoint two Committee on Academics members to the Legislative Committee. The following Committee on Academics members were appointed to serve on the new Legislative Subcommittee of the Council:

a. Jacqueline Blackett, Senior Woman Administrator, Columbia University – Barnard College; and

b. Carolyn Callahan, Faculty Athletics Representative, University of Virginia.

It was recognized that a goal of having two Committee on Academics members on the Legislative Committee is to ensure that efficient and effective communication occurs
between the Council and the Committee on Academics and to act as a legislative communication link between the two governance bodies.

In addition to having committee members serve on the Legislative Committee, the committee continued to support its January recommendation that a Committee on Academics liaison be appointed to the full Council. There is a need to have an academic perspective at Council meetings to reflect the committee's position on matters that impact academics and explain the rationale and answer questions when committee-sponsored legislation is voted on by the Council. During its discussion the committee recognized that the Council may consider alternative approaches, but during its deliberation the Council should consider how best to include a Committee on Academics perspective on matters, both legislative and nonlegislative, that may have an academic nexus and go to the full Council.

The committee also discussed the role of conferences and the best means of tracking autonomy legislation. There is a need for autonomy concepts to proactively identify academic impact, if any, during the development of proposals so as to maintain the division's emphasis on the importance of academics and student-athlete graduation as part of the process.

3. NCAA Division I Academic Progress Rate (APR) -- Calculation of the APR Top 10 Public Recognition – Sports with Small Cohorts. The NCAA Division I Committee on Academic Performance instituted the team-centered public recognition program in 2005-06 to highlight the academic performance of teams in each sport. The committee approved an amendment to its policies and procedures to expand the number of teams in a sport recognized in the Top 10 Public Recognition by the number of teams in the top 10 percent that have a multiyear cohort size of less than 10. For example, if the top 10 percent in a sport includes eight teams with a multiyear cohort size below 10, then the next eight teams beyond the top 10 percent would also be recognized. This policy is effective immediately, beginning with the 2013-14 APR data to be released spring 2015 and not retroactive to any prior cohorts.

Data indicates that teams with small cohort sizes, both absolute (low when compared to teams in any sport) and relative (low only when examined in relation to squad sizes in that sport), receive a disproportionate number of public recognition awards. For example, in 2014 all eight teams in the division with cohort sizes of two or less received public recognition awards, including five teams with a four-year cohort of one student-athlete. When teams with small cohort sizes qualify for public recognition, they exclude other teams with more typical cohort sizes from receiving recognition.
Additionally, teams with small cohorts may utilize the APR squad-size adjustment to potentially avoid NCAA Division I Academic Performance Program (APP) penalties. It may be unfair to teams with typical cohort sizes, when teams with small cohort sizes are both eligible for squad-size adjustment and may more likely to receive public recognition than teams with typical squad sizes. This change maintains the intent of the program, while also providing recognition access for teams that either have a small cohort or a typical sized cohort.

4. **NCAA Division I Legislative Council Subcommittee on Legislative Relief Policy Change – Four-Year College Transfer Student-Athlete and Elimination of Immediate Eligibility – Impact on 4-2-4 Waiver Process.** The NCAA Division I Committee on Academics Subcommittee on Student-Athlete Academics reviewed the updated Legislative Council Subcommittee on Legislative Relief policy that eliminates immediate eligibility for 4-4 transfer student-athletes unable to use the one-time transfer exception. The subcommittee noted that the recent policy change may result in an increase in two-year transfer waivers in instances where a transfer student-athlete may seek alternative methods for immediate eligibility. The subcommittee reaffirmed that enrollment at a two-year institution should not be used to avoid being subject to four-year college transfer legislation. The subcommittee made recommendations for enhancement of the two-year college transfer waiver directive language to indicate there is a high threshold for waiving the one calendar year requirement for 4-2-4 transfer student-athletes. The subcommittee noted that waivers of the one calendar year requirement will generally not be approved. The subcommittee will review the updated directive language at a future meeting, and enhancements to the directive will be finalized by June 2015.

5. **Two-Year College Transfer Waiver Directive -- Waivers Citing Misadvisement.** The Subcommittee on Student-Athlete Academics reviewed examples of waivers citing misadvisement of 2-4 transfer student-athletes when the student-athletes had been advised to enroll at a four-year institution prior to meeting 2-4 transfer requirements. These student-athletes had enrolled at member institutions prior to meeting all the two-year college transfer requirements and may have met the requirements had they delayed enrollment to the four-year institution for one term.

The subcommittee noted that an institution may receive a competitive advantage by providing this misadvisement, yet the subcommittee recognized the impact to the student-athlete should a waiver request with misadvisement mitigation be denied. The subcommittee will consider potential changes to the two-year college transfer waiver directive to address this issue at its next meeting, and the subcommittee anticipates any changes to the directive to be finalized by June 2015.
6. **Redesigned SAT.** The committee received an update regarding the pending redesigned SAT. The College Board will release concordance tables associated with the new SAT in May 2016, following the first administration of the redesigned SAT. Operational measures and communication strategies have been developed and are being refined by the NCAA Eligibility Center to ensure the transition to the new test does not adversely impact prospective student-athletes or member institutions. The committee recognized that there is a condensed timetable between release of the concordance tables in May 2016 and academic certification of some prospective student-athletes for the 2016-17 academic year.

7. **Academic Governance – Future Committee Issues and Topics.** The committee reviewed its slate of future priorities as it moves forward in a new Division I governance structure.

8. **NCAA Research and Data Update.** The committee received an update on current academic research and data-based projects. During this update the committee also previewed early APR trends and indicators in the 2013-14 APR data collected in fall 2014. The committee will review this data in more detail at an upcoming meeting.

9. **Committee and Policy Communications.** The committee is working to be more transparent, accessible, and better inform the membership and the general public of academic policy, legislative matters and rationales. The committee received an update and overview of membership education and outreach initiatives currently in process. The "Academic Primer," a series of one-pager informational documents that will provide insight on academic issues with an emphasis on academic policy matters will be launched in late spring 2015. This element of the committee's strategic communication effort pairs with the first initiative, a newly formatted and user-friendly committee and APP policy and procedures manual. The membership should also anticipate a new Division I academics webpage on NCAA.org that will serve as a central repository and access point for all Division I academic information.

10. **APP Technology.** The committee received an update and timeline on the development of the academic technology portal that will serve as a single point of entry for all NCAA academic related processes. The portal will be more efficient and user-friendly for both the membership and NCAA staff. It is anticipated that the portal will be made available in spring 2016.
11. **NCAA Accelerating Academic Success Program (AASP) Update.** The committee received an update on the AASP. An inaugural AASP conference was held December 12-13, 2014, in New Orleans.

12. **Report of the NCAA Division I Presidential Advisory Group.** The committee reviewed the report of the January 18, 2015, meeting.

13. **Report of the Board of Directors.** The committee reviewed the report of the January 17, 2015, meeting.

14. **Reports of the Committee on Academics.** The committee reviewed the strategic and full reports of the January 16, 2015, meeting.

15. **Report of the NCAA Division I Committee on Academics Subcommittee on Penalties and Appeals.** The committee reviewed the report of the February 12, 2015, teleconference.

16. **Committee Training Sessions.** The committee received two training sessions, one on Level-Three penalty waiver hearings and the other on the APP annual process.

*Committee Chair: Roderick McDavis, Ohio University, Mid-American Conference*

*Staff Liaisons:  Shauna Cobb, Academic and Membership Affairs*
*Azure Davey, Academic and Membership Affairs*
*Diane Dickman, Academic and Membership Affairs*
*Kevin Lennon, Academic and Membership Affairs*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attendees</th>
<th>Absentees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carray Banks, Jr., Norfolk State University</td>
<td>Thomas Yeager, Colonial Athletic Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeri Beggs, Illinois State University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacqueline Blackett, Columbia University – Barnard College (via telephone)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerry Bovee, Weber State University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gregory Burke, Northwestern State University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Burman, University of Wyoming</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolyn Callahan, University of Virginia (via telephone)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Clough, University of Colorado, Boulder</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beth DeBauche, Ohio Valley Conference</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John DeGioia, Georgetown University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pamela Eibec, University of the Pacific</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raymond Harrison, Jr., Texas A&amp;M University, College Station</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhonda Hatcher, Texas Christian University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jarred Koerner, Murray State University (via telephone)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roxanne Levenson, Seattle University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandon Martin, California State University, Northridge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roderick McDavis, Ohio University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renae Myles, Alabama A&amp;M University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurt Zorn, Indiana University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Guests in Attendance:** None.

**NCAA Staff Members in Attendance:** Andy Cardamone, Shauna Cobb, Greg Dana, Azure Davey, Diane Dickman, Doug Healey, Michelle Hosick, Kurt Hunsaker, Kevin Lennon, Andy Louthain, Binh Nguyen, Tom Paskus, Todd Petr, Jen Smith, Naima Stevenson, Kathy Sulentic and Katy Yurk.